RURAL HEALTH CARE CORPORATION

1250 24th Street, NW • Suite 300 • Washington, DC 20037 Phone: (202) 861-2665 • Fax: (202) 861-2991 F-mail: dfaunce@ruralhealthcare.com

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

July 28, 1998

RECEIVED

JUL 28 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Honorable William E. Kennard Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Chairman Kennard:

Honorable William E. Kennard OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

This letter is to advise you that there are several issues pending at the FCC that have had a serious impact on the Rural Health Care Corporation (RHCC) program and budget. If these issues are not resolved promptly, they may delay our ability to provide support to rural health care providers until the end of the year. None of these issues will be resolved or were affected by the proposals to merge RHCC, along with Schools and Libraries Corporation, into the Universal Service Administrative Company. And, they certainly cannot await the resolution of these matters. Accordingly, we ask you to direct your Chief of Staff, John Nakahata to oversee the Commission's efforts to coordinate these matters that have reached an urgent stage.

I.

The initial filing window for rural health care applications closed on July 14, 1998. Some 2000 applications have been received and are being processed. They represent 47 states or U.S. territories, 1095 have been approved, 27 have been denied, and 847 are under review. These figures are cause for satisfaction, particularly in light of the fact that when we began the process in February the Rural Health Care Corporation did not even have a mailing list.

With respect to the management of RHCC, we have approached it as if it were a small business with very limited resources. Cost containment is extremely important for the good of both the program and its participants. We believe that every effort we make to contain administrative expenses benefits the program.

We have also worked hard to provide RHCC's constituents with reliable and timely information. The less confusion about how the program operates the more effectively we can deliver the benefits we were established to provide.

the office today

The Honorable William E. Kennard July 28, 1998
Page 2

II.

Three matters that are now pending before the FCC and have been pending for over three months need to be promptly resolved. Failing to do so will cause additional delays, inefficiencies and costs.

1. Eligible Telecommunications Carriers — By necessity, many rural health care providers must use interexchange carriers to provide all or part of their services. But these IECs do not currently qualify for support under the FCC's interpretation of eligible telecommunications carriers. This has deprived a significant percentage of rural health care providers from needed benefits. The result has been a system that has been complicated to administer and very confusing to applicants. We believe that they should be eligible, and in March sought relief from the FCC on this issue. See also our April 14, 1998, letter.

Notwithstanding this difficulty and confusion and our desire for a prompt resolution of this issue, we heeded the FCC staff's request to proceed with processing these applications prior to clarification of this issue. RHCC's application forms, worksheets, cost formulas, training materials, etc, have all been drafted to exclude IECs from eligibility. We estimate that the costs associated with program design and implementation to exclude IECs was \$65,000. We estimate that it will cost an additional \$19,000 to redesign our programs in order to reflect IEC eligibility. Prompt resolution of this issue enabling IECs to become eligible would reduce delays, limit our costs, speed up efficiency and more effectively serve the purposes for which our program was established.

- 2. Requirement Of Procurement By Contract -- The FCC requires that health care providers and telecommunications service providers that participate in the program must operate under a services procurement contract rather than tariff. But for many rural health care providers and telecommunications service providers, contracts do not exist; instead, contract tariffs are used. As a result, providers that have been purchasing services under a contract tariff are unable to obtain retroactive credit for prior services, and cannot comply with the FCC's rules. This causes confusion among rural health care providers and telecommunications service providers and injects unnecessary costs, delays, uncertainties and confusion. Because this matter continues to be unresolved, we have placed on hold requests for retroactive billing and have placed in reserve certain funds to cover these requests once the matter is clarified. We estimate costs related to this problem are \$108,000.
- 3. Form Approval Revised forms are essential for effective and efficient administration of the program. They allow us to capture needed data in a cost-effective manner. Because OMB approval of these forms would take 60 days, does not appear to be legally required, and would undercut our ability to meet the October 1 deadline for 1999 applications, we are not seeking OMB approval but are proceeding with the revised forms. If questions arise as to our taking this step, we ask that Mr. Nakahata intercede on behalf of this course of action.

The Honorable William E. Kennard July 28, 1998
Page 3

\* \* \*

A fourth, long-standing issue has just been partially resolved by an FCC staff determination that the FCC does not need to approve the terms of RHCC's pre-disbursement audit. This audit must be completed before letters are sent to the health care providers confirming the approved level of support. We want to issue these letters as soon as possible. Unfortunately, because both the ETC and the contract tariff issue are not resolved, the audit will cover procedures that will change if these issues are resolved, adding additional expense and time to the process and delaying confirmation letters for several more months.

III.

Rural health care is a small program but one with strong legislative agency and community support. The Commission has many responsibilities on its plate that are larger in dollar terms. The nuts-and-bolts issues of our program, which are summarized above, can get lost in the press of other FCC business. As documented above, the resulting delays create inefficiencies and impose costs that impair our ability to serve the public interest. We urge that the way to avoid the risk of delays and fragmented communications is for you to ask your Chief of Staff, Mr. Nakahata, to oversee and expedite resolution of these and any issues that emerge in the future.

The rural health care program is a truly exciting, worthwhile and valuable program for rural America -- one for which you have expressed strong support and interest in the past. We hope you will adopt this suggestion to enable us to operate more efficiently, contain costs and provide maximum benefits to the public through rural health care providers.

Respectfully submitted,

Sanford Greenberg

Chairman of the Board

Lee Bailey

President

cc: Mr. John Nakahata

Commissioner Gloria Tristani

Commissioner Susan Ness

Commissioner Michael Powell

Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth

Ms. Cathy Brown